



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,806	10/03/2006	Ralph Painta	INA-PT187 (43640-18us)	1589
3624 7590 10/15/2009				
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				
EXAMINER				
REESE, ROBERT T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3657				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/598,806

Applicant(s)

PAINTA ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT T. REESE

Art Unit

3657

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, and 6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. The amendment filed July 24, 2009, has been entered. Currently, claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uwe et al. (DE 10253495) in view of Brock et al. (2,392,573) further in view of Kraus et al. (2004/0227400).

As per claim 1, Uwe et al disclose: Traction mechanism drive (Figure 1) comprising an integrated generator (attached to element 3) with a traction mechanism roller (exterior of 2), which is arranged on a generator shaft (attached to element 3), on which a traction mechanism is guided (exterior of 2), the traction mechanism roller is decouple able from a generator shaft of the generator via a freewheel (2) for damping peak loads appearing on a drive side. (Figure 1 depicts all of these features)

However, Uwe et al. does not disclose: the generator is mounted in a displaceable manner in order to set the traction mechanism in tension counter to a restoring force.

Brock et al. disclose a tractor generator mounting in which the generator (13) is displaceably mounted (depicted in figure 1) and is set in tension (by spring 28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the starter generator as taught by Uwe et al. to incorporate the generator mounting as taught by Brock et al. to increase the tension on the drive belt for better performance of the belt drive and to reduce vibrations on the belt.

Uwe further does not disclose that the generator is set in tension in a displaceable manner by a hydraulic element.

Kraus et al. discloses a tensioner with an actuator (25) with a hydraulically operated control element (Paragraph 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the starter generator as taught by the combination of Uwe et al. and Brock et al. to incorporate the hydraulically controlled actuator as taught by Kraus et al. to maintain the tension on the drive belt for better performance of the belt drive and to reduce vibrations on the belt.

As per claim 2, Uwe et al. disclose that the generator is a starter generator (paragraph 25, which is the description of Figure 1).

As per claim 4, Brock et al. teaches a tractor generator mounting which includes a mechanical spring element (27).

As per claim 6, Uwe et al. disclose that tractor mechanism is a belt (description of Figure 1).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed July 24, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Brock reference depicts a generator, displaceably mounted and set in tension by a spring (See Brock figure 1). The Kraus reference teaches the use of a hydraulic element (25), in place of a spring, to set an element (10) in a displaceable manner (Paragraph 16 and depicted in figure 1). Kraus's tensioner is configured in a similar manner to Brock's, except that it uses a hydraulic unit to set the element in tension (as opposed to a spring) and the tensioning unit is not a generator. Substituting a hydraulic tensioner in place of a spring tensioner would be an obvious substitution to provide a source of tension to the displaceable generator. Substituting one type of tensioner for another should not be seen as hindsight when the alternate tensioner is well known in the art. As such, it is deemed to be a proper to incorporate this reference to teach this limitation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT T. REESE whose telephone number is (571) 270-5794. The examiner can normally be reached on M_F 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert A. Siconolfi can be reached on (571) 272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RTR